DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 922 UD 018 111

AUTHOR Zeitz, Eileen
TITLE Private Urban Renewal: A Neglected Urban Phenomenon.
PUB DATE Feb 77
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference on the Urban South (Fourth, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, February, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Migration Patterns; Population Distribution; *Population Trends; *Private Financial Support; *Racial Composition; *Trend Analysis; Urban Areas; Urban Environment; Urban Population; *Urban Renewal; Urban Studies
IDENTIFIERS *District of Columbia; District of Columbia (Adams Morgan); District of Columbia (Capitol Hill); District of Columbia (Georgetown)

ABSTRACT

This is a report on the process of private urban renewal of three areas in Washington, D.C. The areas are Georgetown, Capitol Hill and Adams-Morgan. The paper presents an analysis of general population trends and of the change in composition of the population in these three areas. Two general questions are raised: To what extent does the process of private urban renewal involve a change in the population composition of certain areas of the city when compared with the population trend citywide? and, Why has sociological analysis of this phenomenon been lacking to date? Generally the areas of a city experiencing private urban renewal are rehabilitated and upgraded economically, and higher income groups belonging principally to the white middle class replace the poor nonwhite population residing in these sections. Thus, dramatically different socioeconomic groupings and sociocultural milieu are created. The findings of this study indicate that the trend in private urban renewal areas is different from that described in most urban literature and that these changes are being accomplished without benefit of public funds. Probably the major reason why sociologists have failed to examine the process of private urban renewal has to do with the nature of the process itself. As far as can be determined, the dominant pattern in population migration in the U.S. is still one wherein a white population is moving to the suburbs. Part of the reason for sociological neglect of the private urban renewal process is that thus far it has not had a serious impact on inner cities. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152922

PRIVATE URBAN RENEWAL: A NEGLECTED URBAN PHENOMENON

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eileen Zeitz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Eileen Zeitz, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology
George Washington University
Washington, D. C. 20052

*This research was partially funded by Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society of North America.

**Presented at the 4th Annual Conference on The Urban South, Old Dominion University, February 1977, panel on Urban Space and Planning.

UDO 18111

PRIVATE URBAN RENEWAL: A NEGLECTED URBAN PHENOMENON*

Abstract

This is a report of the process of private urban renewal of three areas of the city of Washington, District of Columbia. The areas are Georgetown, Capitol Hill and Adams-Morgan. Generally the areas of a city experiencing private urban renewal are rehabilitated and upgraded economically, and higher income groups belonging principally to the white middle class replace the poor non-white population residing in these sections. Thus, dramatically different socioeconomic groupings and sociocultural milieu are created. The findings of this study indicate that the trend in private urban renewal areas is different from that described in most urban literature and that these changes are being accomplished without benefit of public funds.

*This research was partially funded by Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society of North America.
This paper presented at the 4th Annual Conference on The Urban South, Old Dominion University, February 1977, panel on Urban Space and Planning.

Introduction

The general population trend in United States cities is described as one wherein inner cities are increasingly gaining in Black population while simultaneously losing white population. The history of the District of Columbia has, until most recently, followed this nationwide trend. Moreover, the District of Columbia was the first United States city to house a Black majority population. In 1970 the population of the District was estimated to be 72% Black. This represents a percentage that has been increasing over the past twenty years at a rapid rate.

Table I approximately here

A recent survey indicates that for the first time in decades the number of white households in the city is increasing while the Black household population is remaining stable (Washington Center for Metropolitan Stuides, 1977). Additionally, according to District of Columbia government estimates, the overall white population of the District increased in 1976 for the first time in a quarter of a century. (District of Columbia Municipal Planning Office, 1977). These reported increases in both white households and general white population are not distributed citywide, but rather, are confined to a number of private urban renewal areas in the city. Private urban renewal involves several aspects: change in residential land use, building restoration and rehabilitation, real estate speculation,

social and ethnic change, change in zoning and government involvement and/or lack of involvement. Generally the areas of a city experiencing private urban renewal are rehabilitated and upgraded economically, and higher income groups belonging principally to the white middle class replace the poor non-white population residing in these sections. Thus, dramatically different socioeconomic groupings and sociocultural milieu are created.

This paper presents an analysis of general population trends and the change in composition of the population in three private urban renewal areas of Washington, District of Columbia. Two general questions are raised: To what extent does the process of private urban renewal involve a change in the population composition of certain areas of the city when compared with the population trend citywide? Why has sociological analysis of this phenomenon been lacking to date?

Description of the Process of Private Urban Renewal

In general renewal and rehabilitation are used interchangeably to describe a housing process. Rehabilitation means:

> The restoration of an area in a manner consistent with good city planning so that it becomes an economic asset rather than an economic liability....(Walker, 1976:35).

The distinction between private urban renewal and public, or what is usually termed urban renewal, is significant.

The United States Housing Act of 1954 provided for the rehabilitation of salvageable housing and fully non-residential landuse projects (United States Congress, House, 1954). Subsequent

legislation amplified and enforced public commitment to renewal and enlarged the area of attack from block projects, to the neighborhood, to the city (United States Congress, House, 1958). Under the terms of these Acts, either Federal or local funds are committed and involved in urban renewal. Because of the type of funding involved, some control is maintained by the Federal and/or local government. This is not the case of private urban renewal which is not included in the legislation.

Another distinction is that public renewal usually guarantees that after the renewal is completed, a certain amount of lower income housing remains in the area. The displaced population is usually far larger than the proportion of the lower income population provided for once renewal is completed, but public renewal does guarantee some degree of heterogeneity of population in any given area.[1] Private urban renewal is different because the money spent is privately controlled. There is no Federal or local funding making the renewal possible, nor is there any guarantee of loans. Another difference is that public renewal usually encompasses large areas. The process of private urban renewal is usually undertaken on a more limited scale.

Thus far there has been little examination of this phenomenon in the urban sociological literature, but there is reason to believe, based on information available through the popular media, that private

---

1. For an extensive discussion of population displacement when public urban renewal is undertaken see for example: Hugh Mields, Jr., Federally Assisted New Communities: New Dimensions in Urban Development (Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, 1973; Herbert J. Gans, The Urban Villagers, 1962).

urban renewal is a growing phenomenon and one that has had and will continue to have future long range consequences for the cities in which it is taking place.[2]

Focus of the Study

The focus of this study is the investigation of the process of private urban renewal in one Eastern seaboard city, Washington, District of Columbia. The selection of this city was based upon information already available about private urban renewal in this locale. What is already history is that Washington is a city that has witnessed change in certain areas. For example, Georgetown was once referred to as "the nation's most famous example of slum clearance" (Washington Post, 5 May 1948). Georgetown is an area of the District that had declined over time resulting in a "slum" neighborhood. By 1948 the area had undergone a transformation from a rundown slum area housing a sizeable poor Black population to an elegant well-kept area of the city that is now almost exclusively white. Georgetown is one notable example of the process of private urban renewal. Another illustration is the Capitol Hill section of the District. In what is known as Capitol Hill there are a number of relevant phenomena that can be isolated. For example, between 1960 and 1970 Capitol Hill lost nineteen percent of its total population. It is part of what is known as Service Area Five in the city as a whole. This entire Service Area is made up of nineteen

---

2. This phenomenon has been reported in special feature editions by the New York Times, the Washington Post and the Miami Herald. Two National Back-to-the City Conferences have been held and a third is being planned.

census tracts. As an entire Service Area it has a white population of 16%. The distribution of this population is such that 88% of the white population live in the five census tracts that are experiencing the process of private urban renewal.

Three separate case studies were examined for comparative purposes. The three areas were selected to represent three distinct phases of the process of private urban renewal. Georgetown is the first private urban renewal section of the District. It was selected to represent the most complete phase of the process. Capitol Hill was selected to represent an area in seemingly rapid transition. Adams-Morgan is a section of the District that is experiencing the beginning stages of private urban renewal. It was selected as representing the initial phase of the process.

Method

Because there is virtually no mention of the process of private urban renewal in the sociological literature there is little in the way of guidance for research based on previous studies of the phenomenon. The one notable exception is Firey's (1947) study of Land Use in Central Boston, wherein land on Commonwealth Avenue is purchased by a group of socially prominent people, which in turn sets off a wave of buying in the area, converting what is on its way to becoming a slum into an elegant area. It is difficult to isolate the factors involved in this reverse process, but it is the social prestige of the original group that encourages the

in-migration of others. What motivates the original prestigious population is what Firey (1947) calls "fetishism." This is a process whereby the symbolic attributes of a spatial area become end values in themselves. The "persistence of reputation" or group fondness for a physical area produces a solidarity among some people (in this case a well-off group) that overrides the knowledge that the area is deteriorating. Because of the vagueness of Firey's concepts replication of his method is not possible. However, material available from studies of the process of Black invasion of white areas, and from immigrant invasion of United States cities, is useful in this context (Wheeler, 1962; Molotch, 1971; Handlin, 1951) and some guidelines have been derived from these sources.

A Census of Population and Housing was collected as part of the Decennial Censuses of 1940, 1950, 1960 and 1970. Since these censuses have comparable categories they were utilized to describe population at each time interval in the three areas previously specified. The exact number of census tracts involved in the three areas was established. The first question is to what extent the process of private urban renewal involves a change in the population composition of the areas under examination. In order to answer this question a number of social attributes of the population were examined over three decades.

Data Analysis of General Population Trends

An analysis of the general population trends in Georgetown, Capitol Hill and Adams-Morgan was undertaken for the previously

mentioned periods. As indicated in Table 3, it can be shown that as the process of private urban renewal takes place, population within the affected areas declines. For example, in 1940 the total population of Georgetown was 8,278 and 6,680 in census tracts one and two respectively. Between 1940 and 1950 the total population of the District increased by 139,087 or 121%. During this same time interval, Georgetown, which was in the process of private urban renewal, experienced a decline in total population of 1,229 or 16%. While the entire city was undergoing a major increase in population, Georgetown was in the process of population decline.

Between 1950 and 1960 the total population of the District experienced a decline from 802,178 to 763,956. The population of Georgetown declined again in total population, this time by 28%. This is contrasted to a citywide decline of 5% for the same time interval. This is a substantial decline when considering that Georgetown is comprised of two relatively small census tracts. Between 1960 and 1970 the city again experienced a population decrease from 763,956 to 756,510 or a 1% loss. The total population of Georgetown decreased by 4% during this same time period.

The overall area known as Capitol Hill is composed of ten census tracts. The subdivisions are as follows: (1) restoration areas comprised of those census tracts which are closest to the Capitol building and transition areas comprised of tracts in closest proximity to those tracts; (2) unrestored areas comprised of those

census tracts that have not yet been affected by the process of private urban renewal.

It is difficult to describe the population changes on Capitol Hill between 1940 and 1950 with complete accuracy because there was some shifting of tract boundaries during that period. In general, there was a slight loss of population in nearly every census tract over this period but these slight losses may have been as a result of minor boundary shifts. Between 1950 and 1960, as previously stated, the total population of the District declined by 5%. This trend is reflected in every census tract but one on Capitol Hill. It is likely that this population decline can be accounted for by the general loss of population city-wide during this period. The Capitol Hill area began to manifest differences from the city-wide trend between 1960 and 1970. During this decade the District population declined by 7,500 people or 1% of its total population. It is during this period that the private urban renewal process on Capitol Hill began to gain momentum. For example, the entire geographical area of Capitol Hill lost 10,038 people or 19% of its total population between 1960 and 1970. A tract-by-tract examination shows that population loss was as high as 48% in the census tract closest to the Capitol building, followed by a range from 29% to 25% in the other restoration tracts.

The Adams-Morgan area is at the very beginning stages of the process of private urban renewal. Analysis of census data leads

to the conclusion that the process is not well enough underway to be strongly indicated in the general population trends. Historically the development of Adams-Morgan has reflected the development of the entire city. Between 1940 and 1950 it increased in population in proportion to the remainder of the city. Between 1950 and 1960 it reflects a loss of population in all three tracts which is in keeping with the city-wide loss. The only indication that the process may be beginning in this area is in census tract forty, which has lost 4% of its population between 1960 and 1970. This is not a substantial loss, but it is larger than the city-wide loss of 1% for the same period. There are other indications of change in this census tract that will be discussed in the following sections.

Table 2 approximately here

Social Attributes of the Population - Race

As indicated in Table 3, as the process of private urban renewal takes place, population declines in affected areas. Changes are manifested in racial composition of the population as well. In 1940 the total population of the District was 663,091; 72% white and twenty eight percent Black. The Black population in Georgetown at this point was 42% in the combined tracts. Between 1940 and 1950 the total population of the District increased by 139,087. In this same time period, 1940-1950, the Black population of the District increased by 93,537; an overall increase of 7% city-wide. During this interval the Black population of Georgetown decreased by 17%.

While the entire city was undergoing an increase in total population and an increase in percentage of Black population, Georgetown was declining in total population and the decline included a net loss of 17% of its Black population.

Between 1950 and 1960 the Black percentage of the population of the District increased from 35% to 55%, an overall increase of twenty percent. Again the Black population of the District was rising while Georgetown experienced a further decrease in Black population. This reduced the Black population of Georgetown to 6%. By 1970 the population of Georgetown had steadily decreased and has presently a total Black population of 2%. According to the United States Census reports, in 1940 the Black population of Georgetown was 42% of the total population. By 1970 the Black population of Georgetown was 2% of the total population. It is clear that the process of private urban renewal has occurred in this area. As a result, the population composition not only has changed within the area, but a population trend has developed that is vastly different from the trend occurring city-wide over the same time periods.

In Capitol Hill, the population trend in regard to racial composition over time has followed the city-wide trend. As the racial composition of the city has changed and the Black population has increased, Capitol Hill has reflected this type of change up to 1960. Between 1950 and 1960 the District experienced a dramatic population change. First, the total population declined by 38,222

or 5%. At the same time, 172,602 white population members left the District while 134,380 Blacks joined the population. It was during this period that the share of the Black population of the District rose from 35% to 55%; a 20% increase in a ten year interval. Most of the census tracts on Capitol Hill reflect the city-wide change, ranging from a 4% to 51% increase in Black population across tracts. Between 1960 and 1970 the Black population of the District continued to increase and the white population continued to decrease. As of the 1970 census the racial composition of the District was 72% Black and 28% white; a total reversal in racial composition since 1940 (see Table 1).

In the restoration and transition areas of Capitol Hill between 1960 and 1970 the Black population decreased by a total of 41%. The process of private urban renewal had its beginning in Capitol Hill at a later point in time than in Georgetown, but the patterns of population change are similar. These similarities are manifested both in terms of total population and racial composition of the areas. In every census tract on Capitol Hill there has been some decline in total population, but as the total city-wide population becomes increasingly Black, the restoration and transition areas of Capitol Hill have lost a substantial proportion of Black population.

In Adams-Morgan the census information appears to predate the beginning of the process of private urban renewal. That

something is occurring in the area is clear; at least to the residents of the area. For example, a community spokesman made the following statement to the local newspaper:

> The inner city Adams-Morgan will remain a place where all of us live. Black, white and Spanish speaking; low and middle income families will not categorically be moved to make way for whites to assume our community... We are here today to make clear to the real estate vultures and land speculators...we will not sit back and watch our community be sold out from beneath us like Georgetown and Capitol Hill (Washington Star News 4 November 1973).

Table 3 approximately here

Evidence of the process of private urban renewal in Adams-Morgan based on census data is only suggestive at this time. For example, the one census tract that appears to be at the beginning stages has lost 4% of its total population between 1960 and 1970. Additionally, while the city-wide Black population increased by 21%, this particular census tract only increased in Black population by 1% for the same time period.

Tenancy by Race: Owner Occupied

A breakdown in Black and white owner occupancy patterns renders better information regarding the process of private urban renewal. For example, in Georgetown over the time periods

indicated there is an enormous turnover in Black/white owner occupancy patterns. In both census tracts of Georgetown, the Black owner occupied population steadily declined between 1940 and 1970 while the white home owning population steadily increased, almost doubling during the thirty year period. In 1970 the white owner occupied population amounts to 97% of the total population of the area.

In the restoration and transition tracts of Capitol Hill between 1940 and 1960 the white owner occupied population declined in all but one census tract. Between 1960 and 1970, when the process of private urban renewal was underway, the Black owner occupied population declined in every census tract; the Black owner occupied decline began between 1950 and 1960 in the tract closest to the Capitol building. Between 1960 and 1970 this pattern had spread to other tracts..

The owner occupied population of Adams-Morgan had steadily increased up to 1960. Between 1960 and 1970 the Black owner occupied population had decreased by more than 20% in one census tract. The white owner occupied population had increased by 6% in that same tract.

Table 4 approximately here

Summary of Census Data Analysis

Utilizing Georgetown as a prototype, the process of private

urban renewal in this area has resulted in the following: (a) There is a loss of total population over four decades. Broken down, this statement indicates that this is not only a generalization, but in fact, practically each and every census tract discussed in Table 3 shows a consistent decline in population. This is the case not only at the single points in time of 1940 and 1970, but a measurable and steady decline for each succeeding decade. Significantly, city-wide trends indicate that the total population in 1970 was greater than in 1940. Contrasting the private urban renewal areas with city-wide trends indicates that they appear to be moving in opposite directions; (b) There is a loss of Black population over the four decades examined. The pattern in this case is somewhat less regular than the general population trend discussed above. The data show that only in the restoration census tracts is there a decrease in the percentage of Black population; (c) In the private urban renewal areas there is a consistent increase in home ownership for all census tracts over time. However, when broken down and examined in detail, as shown in Table 4, it appears that it is only home ownership among the white population that is increasing. The Black home owner population is diminishing.

The findings of this study indicate that the trend in private urban renewal areas is different from that described in most urban sociological literature. Additionally, the change is

being accomplished without benefit of public funds. As stated at the outset, a recent survey indicates that for the first time in decades the white population of the District of Columbia is increasing. A more accurate statement would be that the white population is increasing in the private urban renewal areas of the District. A recent report on urban housing indicates that "Cities are Making a Comeback." The report states:

> The cities are now well past the first wave of renovation in blue-chip areas like Washington's Georgetown, Brooklyn's Park Slope, Philadelphia's Society Hill and New Orlean's French Quarter. Now the upswing is spreading to hundreds of less fabled neighborhoods...(New York Times 7 July 1977).

Exactly how much private urban renewal is occurring in various United States cities is an empirical question, but it is one that has been neglected to date in the sociological literature.

Failure to Acknowledge the Process of Private Urban Renewal

Probably the major reason why sociologists have failed to examine the process of private urban renewal has to do with the nature of the process itself. As far as can be determined, the dominant pattern in population migration in the United States is still one wherein a white population is moving to the suburbs. This is a trend that has been well- documented over the past twenty years. Moreover, there is no significant information available to

indicate that this trend is being discontinued. The private urban renewal process is most frequently described in terms of unique individuals whose numbers are too insignificant to create any major changes in the urban population composition.

Urban sociology is most frequently linked to urban social problems. The growth and development of urban areas has long concerned sociologists. Some of the earliest work has focused on rural-urban continuum types of growth. There is considerable emphasis upon change and types of problems that result as cities grown. Part of the reason for sociological neglect of the private urban renewal process is that thus far it has not had serious impact on inner cities. For example, Georgetown has been converted from a slum-like area to an elegant residential area. The impact of this change city-wide has been minimal. Two census tracts in the District have been totally transformed, but the city itself has continued to deteriorate over time. The Black population of the District has continued to increase over time; residential segregation patterns have been maintained; the city has experienced a series of "civil disturbances"; public facilities and public services have continued to decay. Although some parts of the city are in the process of private urban renewal, changes have not manifested and been felt on a city-wide level. The general portrait of United States cities as becoming increasingly Black, poor, and problematic has remained the same over time. This is true of the District as well, despite

private urban renewal.

Private urban renewal is bringing about new types of problems and conflicts. If this trend continues and its pace accelerates, it is likely that the process will be of interest to those studying urban areas. There are indications that private urban renewal in the District is aggravating an already existing housing shortage. In addition, it is displacing a population that is difficult to relocate due to economic considerations. In the District the displaced population is Black, poor and home renting rather than home owning. There is evidence from other cities indicating that poor white populations have been displaced as well. If the process of private urban renewal continues to develop, it is likely to create a housing shortage of greater magnitude. To date little attention has been directed toward those being displaced. If their numbers increase it is likely that they will become a focal interest point.

The housing problem in the urban environment is not new. It has been of interest to sociologists from the outset. The emphasis upon the housing problem in the United States has been first, the problem of housing immigrant populations and later the problem of housing Blacks. Since at least 1950 the emphasis has been upon the latter group. Over time the poor have become concentrated in central cities. The availability of slum housing has allowed for the accomodation of these groups. If the process

of private urban renewal, with its accompanying dimension of housing rehabilitation continues, the supply of housing available to the poor in inner cities may severely diminish. As mentioned previously, public urban renewal has had this effect in many cities. This study has concentrated on the process of private urban renewal in the District of Columbia. There is no reason to believe that the process is unique to this city. It is quite possible that this seemingly individual act of moving into a private urban renewal area of the inner city represents what is in the aggregate, in one city and across numerous cities, a social pattern, indeed an ongoing social process. It is possible that this process will have long term social implications for the future of urban areas.

In an article discussing stratification literature Pease, Form and Rytina (1970) state that:

> ...although individual sociologists sometimes make early and penetrating analyses of the social scene, the profession usually ignores these findings until times of social crises. Thus the disclosure that one-fourth of the nation lives in poverty was as surprising to the average sociologist as it was to the average congressman. The Negro movement was as unexpected by most sociologists as it was by most other middle-class people who thought that things were getting better...

If these authors are correct and if we continue to ignore the

media reports concerning the process of private urban renewal we may find ourselves in the position of wondering where all the ghettos have gone.

References

District of Columbia Municipal Planning Office, Population Report, 1977.

Firey, Walter, Land Use in Central Boston, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Gans, Herbert, The Urban Villagers, New York: Free Press 1962.

Handlin, Oscar, The Uprooted, New York: Grosset and Dunlop, 1951.

Mields, Hugh, Jr., Federally Assisted New Communities: New Dimensions in Urban Development, Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, 1973.

Molotch, Harvey, "Racial Integration in a Transitional Community", American Sociological Review 34 1969:878-93.

New York Times 7 July 1977.

Pease, John; Form, William H. and Rytina, Joan Huber, "Ideological Currents in American Stratification Literature" American Sociologist May 1970:127-37.

United States Congress, Housing Act of 1954, 83rd Congress 1954 H.R. 590.

United States Congress, Housing Act of 1958, 85th Congress, 1958 H.R. 1091.

Walker, Mabel, Urban Blight and Slums, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, Trend Alert, 1977.

Washington Post, 5 May 1948.

Washington Star News, 4 November 1973.

Wheeler, Raymond, "The Relationship Between Negro Invasion and Property Prices in Grand Rapids, Michigan", Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.

TABLE 1

RACIAL COMPOSITION OF THE POPULATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 1800-1970

Decade	% Black	% White	Total Population
1800	23	77	3,210
1810	28	72	8,208
1820	27	73	13,247
1830	29	71	18,827
1840	28	72	23,364
1850	26	74	40,001
1860	18	82	61,122
1870	32	68	109,199
1880	34	66	177,624
1890	33	67	230,392
1900	31	69	278,718
1910	29	71	331,069
1920	25	75	437,571
1930	27	73	486,869
1940	28	72	663,041
1950	35	65	802,178
1960	55	45	763,956
1970	72	28	756,510

SOURCE: Summary of Censuses of the District of Columbia (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1970).

TABLE 2

POPULATION TRENDS IN PRIVATE URBAN RENEWAL AREAS AND CITY WIDE OVER TIME

	1940[a]	1950[b]	1960[c]	1970[d]
City Wide	663,091	802,178	763,956	756,510
Tract Numbers				
1*	8,278	7,658	5,963	5,480
2*	6,680	6,071	5,723	5,974
38**	5,714	6,220	5,173	5,190
39**	5,099	5,643	5,325	6,094
40**	8,528	9,137	7,599	7,289
65***	7,057	6,806	4,730	3,689
67***	7,028	6,938	6,850	5,733
69***	5,393	5,187	4,897	4,043
70***	6,779	6,970	5,973	3,133
71***	4,452	4,215	4,029	4,264
72***	7,183	6,758	5,551	4,290
81***	5,021	5,280	5,599	4,711
82***	6,903	6,473	4,217	2,996

SOURCES:

[a]Population and Housing Statistics for Census Tracts, United States Bureau of Commerce, Table 1, p. 4, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942).

[b]Census Tract Statistics, Washington and Adjacent Area, Table I, p. 7, United States Bureau of Commerce (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1952).

[c]United States Census of Population and Housing, United States Bureau of Commerce, p. 16, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office 1961).

[d]United States Census of Population and Housing, Final Report, General Characteristics of the Population, p. 8, United States Bureau of Commerce (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office 1972).

*Georgetown ***Capitol Hill **Adams-Morgan

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE BLACK POPULATION BY
CENSUS TRACT OVER TIME

Tract Numbers	Time Intervals			
	1940[a]	1950[b]	1960[c]	1970[d]
1*	28	17	5	3
2*	14	8	1	1
38**	41	42	54	76
39**	3	3	10	54
40**	18	25	31	32
65***	24	38	46	27
66***	11	20	24	22
67***	16	32	70	74
69***	20	42	81	93
70***	20	33	69	54
71***	11	24	73	94
72***	79	89	90	93
81***	7	25	76	88
82***	10	16	22	17
83***	21	47	83	91

SOURCES:

[a]Population and Housing Statistics for Census Tracts, Table 1, p. 4, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942).

[b]Census Tract Statistics for Washington, D. C., and Adjacent Areas, Table 1, p. 7, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1952).

[c]Census of Population and Housing, 1960, Final Report, Table P-1, p. 16, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961).

[d]Census of Population and Housing, 1970, Final Report, Table P-1, p. 8, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972).

*Georgetown
**Adams-Morgan
***Capitol Hill

Table 4

TENURE BY RACE: OWNER OCCUPIED POPULATION IN RESTORATION TRACTS OVER TIME*

	Georgetown						Capitol Hill												Adams-Morgan		
	1			2			65			66			70			82			40		
	B	W	%	B	W	%	B	W	%	B	W	%	B	W	%	B	W	%	B	W	%
1940[a]	72	503	87	15	381	96	85	372	81	17	240	93	32	312	91	13	368	96	17	251	94
1950[b]	70	669	91	12	553	98	200	294	69	43	234	84	176	258	59	46	358	89	45	272	86
1960[c]	50	841	94	4	599	99	171	286	63	37	257	87	206	152	42	59	326	85	97	348	78
1970[d]	26	825	97	2	648	100	127	345	73	35	280	89	102	252	71	35	279	89	63	341	84

SOURCES:

[a]Population and Housing Statistics for Census Tracts "Dwelling Units by Occupancy, Status and Race of Occupants", Table 4, p. 41, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942).

[b]United States Census of Population 1950, "Characteristics of Dwelling Units", Vol. III, Table 3, pp. 32-35, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1952).

[c]United States Census of Population and Housing, "Occupancy and Structural Characteristics of Housing Units", pp. 149-158, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961).

[d]United States Census of Population and Housing, "Occupancy and Financial Characteristics of Housing Units", pp. H-1-11, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972).

*Percentage white population.